

REMARKS

Claims 2-8, 10-14, 17, 25-35, and 37-41 are in the case if this Supplemental Amendment is entered.

In response to the Response to Arguments included with the Advisory Action dated January 24, 2007, and the rejections based on prior art in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2006, claims 1 and 10 have been cancelled, and the dependent claims 2-8, 11-15, and 17 have been amended to depend from claim 39 in this Supplemental Amendment.

With respect to claim 35, the Examiner states that in figure 8 in Temple the P+ doped region is vertically thinner than the P- doped well. Section 2125 of the MPEP states that when the reference does not disclose that the drawings are to scale and is silent as the dimensions, arguments based on measurement of the drawing features are of little value. Temple does not state that the drawings are to scale. While Temple does state in lines 43-45 that

P+ shorting region 72 may extend downwardly into P base region 68 more so than as illustrated (FIG. 2), resulting in a relatively wide margin of tolerance in selecting a suitable implant energy for forming the implant shorting region.

there is no recitation in Temple as to the relative thicknesses of the P+ shorting region 72 and the P base region 68. Therefore, it is believed that Temple cannot be relied on as showing that the P+ shorting region 72 is vertically thinner than the P base region 68.

It is believed that the present application, with the entry of this Supplemental Amendment, is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if the Examiner has any matters to address that will facilitate allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

April 16, 2007

Date

Robert D. Lott

Robert D. Lott

Attorney under 37 CFR §1.34

Registration No. 28,441

Hiscock & Barclay, LLP

2000 HSBC Plaza

100 Chestnut Street

Rochester, New York 14604-2404

Phone: (585) 295-4448

Fax: (585) 295-8465